

# **EXHIBIT T**

# **Manual of PATENT EXAMINING PROCEDURE**

Original Eighth Edition, August 2001  
Latest Revision February 2003



**U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE**  
**United States Patent and Trademark Office**

The U.S. Patent and Trademark Office does not handle the sale of the Manual, distribution of notices and revisions, or change of address of those on the subscription list. Correspondence relating to existing subscriptions should be sent to the Superintendent of Documents at the following address:

Superintendent of Documents Telephone: 202-512-2267  
Mail List Section  
Washington, DC 20402

Inquiries relating to purchasing the Manual should be directed to:

Superintendent of Documents Telephone: 202-512-1800  
United States Government Printing Office  
Washington, DC 20402

Orders for reproduced copies of individual replacement pages or of previous revisions of the Manual should be sent to the following address:

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks Telephone: 1-800-972-6382 or 703-308-9726  
Attention: Certification Branch  
Washington, DC 20231

Previous editions and revisions of the Manual are available on microfilm in the Patent Search Room.  
The Manual is available on CD-ROM and on diskette from:

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office Telephone: 703-306-2600  
Office of Electronic Information Products and Services  
Washington, DC 20231

Employees of the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office should direct their requests for the Manual, replacement pages, notices, and revisions to the Patent Academy. Telephone: 703-308-9660

Pursuant to the Patent and Trademark Office Efficiency Act (PTOEA) (Pub. L. 106-113, 113 Stat. 1501A-572), the head of the United States Patent and Trademark Office (USPTO) is the "Under Secretary of Commerce for Intellectual Property and Director of the United States Patent and Trademark Office." The Director is assisted by the "Deputy Under Secretary of Commerce for Intellectual Property and Deputy Director of the United States Patent and Trademark Office." The patent operations of the USPTO are now headed by the "Commissioner for Patents." The trademark operations of the USPTO are now headed by the "Commissioner for Trademarks." Under section 4741(b) of the PTOEA, any reference to the Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks, the Assistant Commissioner for Patents, or the Assistant Commissioner for Trademarks is deemed to refer to the Director, the Commissioner for Patents, or the Commissioner for Trademarks, respectively. See "Reestablishment of the Patent and Trademark Office as the United States Patent and Trademark Office" published in the *Federal Register* at 65 FR 17858 (Apr. 5, 2000), and in the *Official Gazette of the United States Patent and Trademark Office* at 1234 O.G. 41 (May 9, 2000).

Additions to the text of the Manual are indicated by arrows (><) inserted in the text. Deletions are indicated by a single asterisk (\*) where a single word was deleted and by two asterisks (\*\*) where more than one word was deleted. The use of three or five asterisks in the body of the laws, rules, treaties, and administrative instructions indicates a portion of the law, rule, treaty, or administrative instruction which was not reproduced.

First Edition, November 1949  
Second Edition, November 1953  
Third Edition, November 1961  
Fourth Edition, June 1979  
Fifth Edition, August 1983  
Sixth Edition, January 1995  
Seventh Edition, July 1998  
Eighth Edition, August 2001  
Revision 1, February 2003

## Foreword

This Manual is published to provide U.S. Patent and Trademark Office patent examiners, applicants, attorneys, agents, and representatives of applicants with a reference work on the practices and procedures relative to the prosecution of patent applications before the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office. It contains instructions to examiners, as well as other material in the nature of information and interpretation, and outlines the current procedures which the examiners are required or authorized to follow in appropriate cases in the normal examination of a patent application. The Manual does not have the force of law or the force of the rules in Title 37 of the Code of Federal Regulations.

A separate manual entitled "Trademark Manual of Examining Procedure" is published by the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office as a reference work for trademark cases.

Examiners will be governed by the applicable statutes, rules, decisions, and orders and instructions issued by the Commissioner and the Assistant Commissioners. Orders and Notices still in force which relate to the subject matter included in this Manual are incorporated in the text. Orders and Notices, or portions thereof, relating to the examiners' duties and functions which have been omitted or not incorporated in the text may be considered obsolete. Interference procedure not directly involving the Primary Examiner are not included in this Manual and, therefore, Orders and Notices relating thereto remain in force.

Subsequent changes in practice and other revisions will be incorporated in the form of substitute or additional pages for the Manual.

Suggestions for improving the form and content of the Manual are always welcome. They should be addressed to:

Box MPEP  
Assistant Commissioner for Patents  
Washington, DC 20231

## Chapter 2100 Patentability

<b>2105</b>	<b>Patentable Subject Matter — Living Subject Matter</b>	<b>2126</b>	<b>Availability of a Document as a “Patent” for Purposes of Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. 102(a), (b), and (d)</b>
<b>2106</b>	<b>Patentable Subject Matter — Computer-Related Inventions</b>	2126.01	Date of Availability of a Patent As a Reference
2106.01	Computer Programming and 35 U.S.C. 112, First Paragraph	2126.02	Scope of Reference’s Disclosure Which Can Be Used to Reject Claims When the Reference Is a “Patent” but Not a “Publication”
2106.02	Disclosure in Computer Programming Cases	<b>2127</b>	<b>Domestic and Foreign Patent Applications as Prior Art</b>
<b>2107</b>	<b>General Principles Governing Utility Rejections</b>	<b>2128</b>	<b>“Printed Publications” as Prior Art</b>
2107.01	Procedural Considerations Related to Rejections for Lack of Utility	2128.01	Level of Public Accessibility Required
2107.02	Special Considerations for Asserted Therapeutic or Pharmacological Utilities	2128.02	Date Publication Is Available as a Reference
<b>2111</b>	<b>Claim Interpretation; Broadest Reasonable Interpretation</b>	<b>2129</b>	<b>Admissions as Prior Art</b>
2111.01	Plain Meaning	<b>2131</b>	<b>Anticipation — Application of 35 U.S.C. 102(a), (b), and (e)</b>
2111.02	*>Effect< of Preamble	2131.01	Multiple Reference 35 U.S.C. 102 Rejections
2111.03	Transitional Phrases	2131.02	Genus-Species Situations
<b>2112</b>	<b>Requirements of Rejection Based on Inherency; Burden of Proof</b>	2131.03	Anticipation of Ranges
2112.01	Composition, Product, and Apparatus Claims	2131.04	Secondary Considerations
2112.02	Process Claims	2131.05	Nonanalogous Art
<b>2113</b>	<b>Product-by-Process Claims</b>	<b>2132</b>	<b>35 U.S.C. 102(a)</b>
<b>2114</b>	<b>Apparatus and Article Claims — Functional Language</b>	2132.01	Publications as 35 U.S.C. 102(a) Prior Art
<b>2115</b>	<b>Material or Article Worked Upon by Apparatus</b>	<b>2133</b>	<b>35 U.S.C. 102(b)</b>
<b>2116</b>	<b>Material Manipulated in Process</b>	2133.01	Rejections of Continuation-In-Part (CIP) Applications
2116.01	Novel, Unobvious Starting Material or End Product	2133.02	Rejections Based on Publications and Patents
<b>2121</b>	<b>Prior Art; General Level of Operability Required to Make a Prima Facie Case</b>	2133.03	Rejections Based on “Public Use” or “On Sale”
2121.01	Use of Prior Art in Rejections Where Operability Is in Question	2133.03(a)	“Public Use”
2121.02	Compounds and Compositions — What Constitutes Enabling Prior Art	2133.03(b)	“On Sale”
2121.03	Plant Genetics — What Constitutes Enabling Prior Art	2133.03(c)	The “Invention”
2121.04	Apparatus and Articles — What Constitutes Enabling Prior Art	2133.03(d)	“In This Country”
<b>2122</b>	<b>Discussion of Utility in the Prior Art</b>	2133.03(e)	Permitted Activity; Experimental Use
<b>2123</b>	<b>Rejection Over Prior Art’s Broad Disclosure Instead of Preferred Embodiments</b>	2133.03(e)(1)	Commercial Exploitation
<b>2124</b>	<b>Exception to the Rule That the Critical Reference Date Must Precede the Filing Date</b>	2133.03(e)(2)	Intent
<b>2125</b>	<b>Drawings as Prior Art</b>	2133.03(e)(3)	“Completeness” of the Invention
		2133.03(e)(4)	Factors Indicative of an Experimental Purpose
		2133.03(e)(5)	Experimentation and Degree of Supervision and Control
		2133.03(e)(6)	Permitted Experimental Activity and Testing
		2133.03(e)(7)	Activity of an Independent Third Party Inventor
		<b>2134</b>	<b>35 U.S.C. 102(c)</b>
		<b>2135</b>	<b>35 U.S.C. 102(d)</b>
		2135.01	The Four Requirements of 35 U.S.C. 102(d)
		<b>2136</b>	<b>35 U.S.C. 102(e)</b>
		2136.01	Status of U.S. Patent as a Reference Before and After Issuance
		2136.02	Content of the Prior Art Available Against the Claims
		2136.03	Critical Reference Date

claim limitation”); *Kropa v. Robie*, 187 F.2d at 152, 88 USPQ2d at 480-81 (preamble is not a limitation where claim is directed to a product and the preamble merely recites a property inherent in an old product defined by the remainder of the claim); *STX LLC. v. Brine*, 211 F.3d 588, 591, 54 USPQ2d 1347, 1350 (Fed. Cir. 2000) (holding that the preamble phrase “which provides improved playing and handling characteristics” in a claim drawn to a head for a lacrosse stick was not a claim limitation). >Compare *In re Cruciferous Sprout Litig.*, 301 F.3d 1343, 1346-48, 64 USPQ2d 1202, 1204-05 (Fed. Cir. 2002) (A claim at issue was directed to a method of preparing a food rich in glucosinolates wherein cruciferous sprouts are harvested prior to the 2-leaf stage. The court held that the preamble phrase “rich in glucosinolates” helps define the claimed invention, as evidenced by the specification and prosecution history, and thus is a limitation of the claim (although the claim was anticipated by prior art that produced sprouts inherently “rich in glucosinolates”).)<

During examination, statements in the preamble reciting the purpose or intended use of the claimed invention must be evaluated to determine whether the recited purpose or intended use results in a structural difference (or, in the case of process claims, manipulative difference) between the claimed invention and the prior art. If so, the recitation serves to limit the claim. See, e.g., *In re Otto*, 312 F.2d 937, 938, 136 USPQ 458, 459 (CCPA 1963) (The claims were directed to a core member for hair curlers and a process of making a core member for hair curlers. Court held that the intended use of hair curling was of no significance to the structure and process of making.); *In re Sinex*, 309 F.2d 488, 492, 135 USPQ 302, 305 (CCPA 1962) (statement of intended use in an apparatus claim did not distinguish over the prior art apparatus). If a prior art structure is capable of performing the intended use as recited in the preamble, then it meets the claim. See, e.g., *In re Schreiber*, 128 F.3d 1473, 1477, 44 USPQ2d 1429, 1431 (Fed. Cir. 1997) (anticipation rejection affirmed based on Board’s factual finding that the reference dispenser (a spout disclosed as useful for purposes such as dispensing oil from an oil can) would be capable of dispensing popcorn in the manner set forth in appellant’s claim 1 (a dispensing top for dispensing popcorn in a specified

manner)) and cases cited therein. See also MPEP § 2112 - § 2112.02.

### 2111.03 Transitional Phrases

The transitional phrases “comprising”, “consisting essentially of” and “consisting of” define the scope of a claim with respect to what unrecited additional components or steps, if any, are excluded from the scope of the claim.

The transitional term “comprising”, which is synonymous with “including,” “containing,” or “characterized by,” is inclusive or open-ended and does not exclude additional, unrecited elements or method steps. See, e.g., *Genentech, Inc. v. Chiron Corp.*, 112 F.3d 495, 501, 42 USPQ2d 1608, 1613 (Fed. Cir. 1997) (“Comprising” is a term of art used in claim language which means that the named elements are essential, but other elements may be added and still form a construct within the scope of the claim.); *Moleculon Research Corp. v. CBS, Inc.*, 793 F.2d 1261, 229 USPQ 805 (Fed. Cir. 1986); *In re Baxter*, 656 F.2d 679, 686, 210 USPQ 795, 803 (CCPA 1981); *Ex parte Davis*, 80 USPQ 448, 450 (Bd. App. 1948) (“comprising” leaves “the claim open for the inclusion of unspecified ingredients even in major amounts”).

The transitional phrase “consisting of” excludes any element, step, or ingredient not specified in the claim. *In re Gray*, 53 F.2d 520, 11 USPQ 255 (CCPA 1931); *Ex parte Davis*, 80 USPQ 448, 450 (Bd. App. 1948) (“consisting of” defined as “closing the claim to the inclusion of materials other than those recited except for impurities ordinarily associated therewith.”). A claim which depends from a claim which “consists of” the recited elements or steps cannot add an element or step. When the phrase “consists of” appears in a clause of the body of a claim, rather than immediately following the preamble, it limits only the element set forth in that clause; other elements are not excluded from the claim as a whole. *Mannesmann Demag Corp. v. Engineered Metal Products Co.*, 793 F.2d 1279, 230 USPQ 45 (Fed. Cir. 1986).

The transitional phrase “consisting essentially of” limits the scope of a claim to the specified materials or steps “and those that do not materially affect the basic and novel characteristic(s)” of the claimed invention. *In re Herz*, 537 F.2d 549, 551-52, 190 USPQ 461, 463 (CCPA 1976) (emphasis in origi-

nal) (Prior art hydraulic fluid required a dispersant which appellants argued was excluded from claims limited to a functional fluid "consisting essentially of" certain components. In finding the claims did not exclude the prior art dispersant, the court noted that appellants' specification indicated the claimed composition can contain any well-known additive such as a dispersant, and there was no evidence that the presence of a dispersant would materially affect the basic and novel characteristic of the claimed invention. The prior art composition had the same basic and novel characteristic (increased oxidation resistance) as well as additional enhanced detergent and dispersant characteristics.). "A 'consisting essentially of' claim occupies a middle ground between closed claims that are written in a 'consisting of' format and fully open claims that are drafted in a 'comprising' format." *PPG Industries v. Guardian Industries*, 156 F.3d 1351, 1354, 48 USPQ2d 1351, 1353-54 (Fed. Cir. 1998). See also *Atlas Powder v. E.I. duPont de Nemours & Co.*, 750 F.2d 1569, 224 USPQ 409 (Fed. Cir. 1984); *In re Janakirama-Rao*, 317 F.2d 951, 137 USPQ 893 (CCPA 1963); *Water Technologies Corp. vs. Calco, Ltd.*, 850 F.2d 660, 7 USPQ2d 1097 (Fed. Cir. 1988). For the purposes of searching for and applying prior art under 35 U.S.C. 102 and 103, absent a clear indication in the specification or claims of what the basic and novel characteristics actually are, "consisting essentially of" will be construed as equivalent to "comprising." See, e.g., *PPG*, 156 F.3d at 1355, 48 USPQ2d at 1355 ("PPG could have defined the scope of the phrase 'consisting essentially of' for purposes of its patent by making clear in its specification what it regarded as constituting a material change in the basic and novel characteristics of the invention."). See also *In re Janakirama-Rao*, 317 F.2d 951, 954, 137 USPQ 893, 895-96 (CCPA 1963). If an applicant contends that additional steps or materials in the prior art are excluded by the recitation of "consisting essentially of," applicant has the burden of showing that the introduction of additional steps or components would materially change the characteristics of applicant's invention. *In re De Lajarte*, 337 F.2d 870, 143 USPQ 256 (CCPA 1964). See also *Ex parte Hoffman*, 12 USPQ2d 1061, 1063-64 (Bd. Pat. App. & Inter. 1989) ("Although 'consisting essentially of' is typically used and defined in the context of compositions of matter, we find nothing

intrinsicly wrong with the use of such language as a modifier of method steps. . . [rendering] the claim open only for the inclusion of steps which do not materially affect the basic and novel characteristics of the claimed method. To determine the steps included versus excluded the claim must be read in light of the specification. . . . [I]t is an applicant's burden to establish that a step practiced in a prior art method is excluded from his claims by 'consisting essentially of' language.").

## OTHER TRANSITIONAL PHRASES

Transitional phrases such as "having" must be interpreted in light of the specification to determine whether open or closed claim language is intended. See, e.g., *Lampi Corp. v. American Power Products Inc.*, 228 F.3d 1365, 1376, 56 USPQ2d 1445, 1453 (Fed. Cir. 2000) (The term "having" was interpreted as open terminology, allowing the inclusion of other components in addition to those recited); *Crystal Semiconductor Corp. v. TriTech Microelectronics Int'l Inc.*, 246 F.3d 1336, 1348, 57 USPQ2d 1953, 1959 (Fed. Cir. 2001) (term "having" in transitional phrase "does not create a presumption that the body of the claim is open"); *Regents of the Univ. of Cal. v. Eli Lilly & Co.*, 119 F.3d 1559, 1573, 43 USPQ2d 1398, 1410 (Fed. Cir. 1997) (In the context of a cDNA having a sequence coding for human PI, the term "having" still permitted inclusion of other moieties.). The transitional phrase "composed of" has been interpreted in the same manner as either "consisting of" or "consisting essentially of," depending on the facts of the particular case. See *AFG Industries, Inc. v. Cardinal IG Company*, 239 F.3d 1239, 1245, 57 USPQ2d 1776, 1780-81 (Fed. Cir. 2001) (based on specification and other evidence, "composed of" interpreted in same manner as "consisting essentially of"); *In re Bertsch*, 132 F.2d 1014, 1019-20, 56 USPQ 379, 384 (CCPA 1942) ("Composed of" interpreted in same manner as "consisting of"; however, court further remarked that "the words 'composed of' may under certain circumstances be given, in patent law, a broader meaning than 'consisting of.'").

## 2112 Requirements of Rejection Based on Inherency; Burden of Proof

The express, implicit, and inherent disclosures of a prior art reference may be relied upon in the rejection